

Planning Grant Round 2 Questions and Answers

The following are Planning Grant Round 2 questions asked of DWR at workshops as well as through email. These questions have been selected and presented here based on their applicability to a wide range of applicants. The answers are provided as additional guidance to planning grant applicants. Questions related to Implementation and Stormwater Grants are not included in this document. DWR will provide answers to Implementation and Stormwater grant questions throughout the process of draft PSP release/comment and applicant workshops for those grants.

Q1. What are DWR's preferences on Scope of Work (SOW) with respect to the level of details (i.e. task and subtask)?

A1. There is no preference for task vs. subtask in the work plan. Look at your work plan as a communication tool. If it's necessary to split out subtasks for communication reasons, use subtasks. If it's not necessary, don't use them.

Q2. What constitutes match funding? Can it include processes as well as documentation?

A2. Funding Match, as defined in the Guidelines, are funds made available by the applicant to assist in financing a project. Funding match consists of non-State funds and can include in-kind services. In-kind services must relate directly to the scope of work funded in the grant proposal. As such, funding match could be processes or documentation. However, it must be part of the scope, and, in this specific case, should be necessary in producing the revised or new IRWM plan.

Q3. How do we document In-Kind match?

A3. In the grant application, DWR does ask for a basis of estimate for budget items. Applicants need to supply the logic used to arrive at the costs. The basis of estimate can be text, sample calculations, or a combination. You may use lump sum cost estimates in your application as long as you explain why the lump sum makes sense. Documenting in-kind match if you are successful in the grant process becomes more detailed regarding records retained and what documentation needs to be submitted with invoices as funding match is claimed.

Q4. Should the applicant cite which percentage of the Work Plan will go to disadvantaged Communities (DACs)? (Not all work plans will have it as a task but instead they have it as a process).

A4. While DWR understands that some tasks that ensure the participation of DAC in IRWM planning efforts are blended into other tasks and budget items in a process, the fact that there is a statewide funding target and the fact that there is a scoring criteria will impact how you present such work in the work plan and budget. When awarding grant funds, DWR must determine the amount of grant funds that will be expended for activities that support the participation of DACs in IRWM planning efforts.

To make sure your application addresses the DAC Involvement criterion, and garners the associated points, reviewers will have to be able to identify that work in the work plan. So while work may be intertwined in a process, it probably does benefit the applicant to configure the work plan so that reviewers can identify parts of work effort that facilitate and support participation of DACs and also

identify corresponding budget information. Whether this is done with footnotes, sub-tasks, text, etc... is up to the applicant.

Q5. Can we use Round 1 resolution for this Round?

A5. It depends how the resolution was written. Some applicants' resolutions were worded so that they could be used in multiple solicitations. Others are more specifically worded. If you have a specific case you'd like to discuss, please contact us.

Q6. In the BMS checklist, are the in-kind service contribution and funding match contribution (federal, local, or other) weighted differently?

A6. No. The different contributions to your budget that you enter into BMS are for reporting purposes. What amounts you allocate to different categories have no effect on application score.

Q7. How does DWR determine a DAC? Is there any other criterion beside median household income (MHI)?

A7. The DAC definition for Proposition 84 is tied to MHI (see the bond law). Determination of DAC's is the task of IRWMs and not DWR.

Q8. How does SBx7-6 (California Statewide Elevation Monitoring (CASGEM)) affect this round of funding for Planning and Implementation?

A8. As stated in the PSP, groundwater monitoring is part of the eligibility criteria. The CASGEM program is still determining monitoring entities and is not at the point where unmonitored basins have been identified. If that status is the same when applications are reviewed, there would be no an impact to applicants.

Q9. How do we know who our Regional Service Representative (RSR) is?

A9. Visit our website <http://www.water.ca.gov/irwm/docs/FundingAreaContacts/FundingArea.pdf> or email dwr_irwm@water.ca.gov.

Q10. Are regions who already received Planning funds disadvantaged in this round of funding from those who haven't?

A10. Reviewing the Criteria table (Table 5) the only "disadvantage" is if the tiebreaker points are applied. In such cases IRWMs that have already received funds would not be provided additional tiebreaker points. The application of tiebreaker points would occur when DWR is getting to the end of available funding and two or more grant applications are tied.

Q11. If you have additional work that will go on outside of creating a standard compliant plan could you use the 3rd section of work plan to discuss this information?

A11. It depends on if you asking for grant funding or not. If the work is not part of the scope for grant funding then yes, it could be discussed in the 3rd section of the work plan, Additional IRWM Plan work. In either case, you should be using the 1st section of the work plan, Current Status in Meeting IRWM Plan Standards, to present the status of meeting plan standards and then stating the additional work that needs to be performed and how it is beneficial to the plan.

Q12. Our region, as a whole, is a DAC, but not every town in the County is a DAC. Because of this can we say our whole proposal goes to help DACs? And do we need to provide our MHI?

A12. The Planning Grant PSP does not ask for MHI information. Within the Planning Grant application it is possible to look at the whole region as disadvantaged. The applicant would still have to explain how each task in the proposal supports participation of DACs in the planning process. The applicant should also be aware that in implementation grants, DWR will ask for MHI supporting documentation and the applicant will need to establish a link between project benefit and DAC needs..

Q13. For Program Preferences, if you don't have objectives but can make a connection to the work being done in the work plan to meeting the program preferences would this be acceptable?

A13. Certainly the simplest example of a plan meeting a program preference is if an objective of the plan clearly meets the preference. However, meeting a preference is not limited to the preference being an objective in the plan. The applicant has the burden of explaining how implementing a plan as revised meets the program preference.

Q14. Under an interregional grant application, could the grant request be for a full \$1 million as long as \$250,000 local match was available?

A14. Remember funding match is 25% of total project cost not 25% of grant request. The way the PSP is written, yes, an applicant could request \$1M grant funding for an interregional proposal as long as the total project cost allowed for adequate funding match. However, what applicants should remember is there is \$9M remaining in Round 2 for planning grants of any type. All in all there are 48 IRWM regions. Between rounds 1 and 2 there is \$30M for planning. Not every IRWM can receive \$1M for planning grant. The competition only increases as interregional proposals are added into the mix.

Q15. Based on the Prop 84 IRWM Planning Round2 PSP, the work of an interregional proposal must be incorporated into the respective IRWM plan updates. Since the timetable for completion of the IRWM plan updates and the interregional planning work may not match, is it expected that the work would be incorporated into the IRWM plans as an addendum to the adopted respective plans? Would the interregional plan have two years to complete similar to the regional plans?

A15. DWR assumes that a standards compliant IRWM plan would include provisions for updating the plan, formally or informally, see page 39 of the guidelines under the governance standard. DWR would then also assume an IRWM effort would follow their own plan in making revisions to that plan. As to the assumed length of the project work, page 17 of the PSP, attachment 5, asks applicants to assume an approximate 2 year timeline. Based on the criteria table, page 19 of the PSP, there is no benefit or penalty of being longer or shorter than 2 years.

Q16. Do we need a list of Projects in our IRWM Plan or just a process listed for vetting them?

A16. From the IRWM guidelines page 48, "The IRWM Plan must also contain the product of the project selection process, the project list(s). The project list may be quite extensive or change over time. In such cases, it is acceptable for an IRWM Plan to contain a hyperlink or URL to where the list(s) can be viewed. At a minimum, the IRWM Plan needs to demonstrate that the selection process has been conducted and there are identified projects that will implement the IRWM Plan."

Q17. Is BMS more functional from the previous rounds?

A17. Yes. Many of the prior BMS issues have already been fixed. If additional issues are encountered, please bring them to DWR's attention. DWR recommends not waiting until the due date to begin entering your proposal in BMS.

Q18. Where do we place background data for our Region in the round 2 planning application?

A18. Assuming background data means any background information on the IRWM region, please consider that the IRWM region has already completed the Regional Acceptance Process to eligible to apply for grant. The grant application does not ask the applicant to repeat information provided in the RAP nor is such information directly considered in scoring of the application. If the applicant feels such information is necessary for reviewers to understand the status of the plan with regards to meeting plan standards, or work plan tasks, or additional work being performed outside the grant, then the information belongs to one of the sections of the work plan (see page 16 and 17 of the PSP).

Q19. I have a region that has its own Plan similar to what is required in the standards compliant IRWM Plan. Conditions in the region have changed since writing their plan. Can we apply for funds to improve our current plan which meets DWR standards for a standards compliant plan?

A19. Yes. In the slides for this workshop, slide 13 gives you the primary and secondary items to address in the first section of the work plan. Make sure you explain that the existing "functionally equivalent" plan meets the current plan standards and there is additional data gap or other areas of need. Make sure you explain how addressing these areas of need are necessary for plan function.

Q20. One task is admin which includes tracking in kind match, budget, reporting etc. When tracking this in the budget of our proposal, can we just give a flat percentage or do we need to break down costs, i.e. either hour and rates or justification for the percentage of admin we are claiming?

A20 As long as the applicant can provide some basis of estimate that explains the logic for the cost estimate in the application so the reviewer understands that the estimate is reasonable, that criterion in the application process should be satisfied. If the application is successful, invoicing for administrative costs will require back up documentation tied to direct costs and not a percentage.

Q21. Will the amount we request affect our score? For example if we request the full \$1 million are we less likely to receive an award had we requested \$500,000 instead?

A21. There is nothing in the scoring criteria that is based on the grant amount requested.